

1 On March 14, 2000, the DOP Director's designee, Paul Peterson, conducted an allocation review of
2 Appellant's position. By letter dated May 8, 2000, Mr. Peterson determined that Appellant's
3 position was properly allocated to the Information Technology Applications Specialist 4
4 classification. On June 2, 2000, Appellant filed timely exceptions to the Director's determination
5 with the Personnel Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

6 Appellant's position is responsible for the DOL's automated Master License Service (MLS)
7 application. Appellant's CQ indicates that the MLS is a mission critical, high-risk agency program
8 that impacts external customers, other state agencies and other government entities. While
9 Appellant is responsible for the application, her supervisor is the system architect responsible for
10 the total system. All parties agree that the MLS application is a "major, high risk/high impact
11 application" and is encompassed by the ITAS 5. The issue on exceptions is whether the ITAS 5
12 level requires responsibility for the application or for the system.

13
14 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant argues that the ITAS 5 classification is intended
15 to encompass positions that work with applications not with systems as determined by the director's
16 designee. Appellant further argues that she is responsible for the MLS application while her
17 supervisor is responsible for the system. Therefore, Appellant contends that her position should be
18 allocated to the ITAS 5 classification.

19
20 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that Appellant is responsible for a
21 portion of the MLS system and is not responsible for the system as a whole. Respondent further
22 argues that the MLS application is not agency-wide but rather is specific to the MLS system.
23 Respondent asserts that Appellant's position is properly allocated to the ITAS 4 classification.

24 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position was properly
25 allocated to the Information Technology Applications Specialist 4 classification should be affirmed.

1 **Relevant Classifications.** Information Technology Applications Specialist 4, class code 03294,
2 and Information Technology Applications Specialist 5, class code 03295.

3 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
4 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
5 measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
6 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in
7 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular
8 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the
9 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.
10 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).
11

12 At the ITAS 4 level, incumbents perform professional-level duties with a focus on system specific
13 applications rather than agency-wide applications and are responsible for "multiple applications of
14 moderate size/complexity or a large, major application that is vital to program delivery."

15 At the ITAS 5 level, incumbents are professional, technical specialists whose are responsible for
16 agency-level, large-scale applications, projects or databases that have high risk and high impact.
17 Incumbents at this level utilize broad technical knowledge in analyzing, consulting, designing,
18 programming, maintaining, or supporting major applications, support products, projects, databases
19 or database management systems.
20

21 We agree with the Director's designee that the MLS application falls within the ITAS 5
22 classification. However, we disagree with his determination that responsibility for the MLS system
23 is key to the allocation. The ITAS 5 specification clearly refers to responsibility for agency-level,
24 large-scale, major applications which is precisely what the MLS is. Appellant has responsibility for
25 the MLS application. Furthermore, the record before the Board shows that the MLS application has
26 agency-wide impact as well as impact on outside entities and governments and on all business

1 owners in the state of Washington. Appellant's duties and responsibilities fall within the ITAS 5
2 classification.

3 **Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be granted and her position should be
4 reallocated to the Information Technology Applications Specialist 5 classification. The
5 determination of the Director, dated May 8, 2000, should be reversed.
6

7 **ORDER**

8 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is
9 granted, the determination of the Director, dated May 8, 2000, is reversed, and Appellant's position
10 is reallocated to the Information Technology Applications Specialist 5 classification.

11 DATED this _____ day of _____, 2001.

12 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD
13

14 _____
15 Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair
16

17 _____
18 Leana D. Lamb, Member
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26